APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,467	11/13/2003	Terry Michael Bleizeffer	RSW920030160US1	9433

36736   7590   05/10/2007

DUKE W. YEE
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
DASGUPTA, SOUMYA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/712,467	BLEIZEFFER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Soumya (Ronnie) Dasgupta	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/13/2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/13/2003*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the following communication: The application (10/712467) was filed on 11/13/2003.

Claim 1-24 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 24 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 5, 15, 21, 22, & 23 contains the trademark/trade name "Java". Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe an object oriented application language developed by Sun Microsystems and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 24:

- The claim fails to place the invention within one statutory class of invention. On page 20, lines 2-11 of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends the "medium" to use signals. As such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and this is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
> States.

3.   Claims 1, 11, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohta (US 5697788; hereafter Ohta).

Claim 1:

- Ohta teaches a method for presenting a step of a task, wherein the task includes a series of steps to be performed, the method comprising: identifying a current

step within the series of steps; retrieving a step component for the current step; and presenting the current step inline within the series of steps such that the step component is presented in context within the series of steps (Fig. 15).

- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the present program while the program created by a selected programming language is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description). The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action.

Claim 11:

- Ohta teaches an apparatus for presenting a step of a task, wherein the task includes a series of steps to be performed, the apparatus comprising: means for identifying a current step within the series of steps; means for retrieving a step component for the current step; and means for presenting the current step inline within the series of steps such that the step component is presented in context within the series of steps (Fig. 15).

- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the present program while the program created by a selected programming language is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description). The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action.

Claim 24:

- Ohta teaches a computer program product, in a computer readable medium, for presenting a step of a task, wherein the task includes a series of steps to be performed, the computer program product comprising: instructions for identifying

a current step within the series of steps; instructions for retrieving a step

component for the current step; and instructions for presenting the current step

inline within the series of steps such that the step component is presented in

context within the series of steps (Fig. 15).

- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the

  present program while the program created by a selected programming language

  is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description). The

  examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding

  steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected

  action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating

        obviousness or nonobviousness.

6.　　　Claims 2-4 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ohta (US 5697788; hereafter Ohta) in view of Broulik et al (US 6323881; hereafter Broulik).

Claim 2:

Ohta *discloses* **a method wherein identifying a current step within the series of steps includes receiving a request from a client.**

- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the present program while the program created by a selected programming language is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description).

- The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action.

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose **receiving a request from a client.**

Broulik discloses **receiving a request from a client.**

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63);...and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm... and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network or web-based system in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

Claim 3:

Ohta discloses *a method that identifies a user selection of the current step within the series of steps*.

- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the present program while the program created by a selected programming language is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description).

- The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action.

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose *a request from a client*.

Broulik discloses *a request from a client*.

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63); ...and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a

Application/Control Number: 10/712,467   · · nber.   Page 8 ·7

Art Unit: 2109

time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks
(programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for
execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col
3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server
paradigm… and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines
50-55).

The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used.
The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the
server sends a response to the client.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of
graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the
art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that
identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client
and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline
representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system
in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

Claim 4:

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose *a method wherein the request is a
HyperText Transfer Protocol.*

Broulik discloses *a method wherein the request is a HyperText Transfer Protocol.*

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3,
  lines 55-63); …and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a
  time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks
  (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for

execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm... and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client. The HyperText Transfer Protocol (http) server is used to receive requests from clients.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

Claim 12:

Ohta *discloses **an apparatus wherein the means for identifying a current step within the series of steps includes receiving a request from a client.***

- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the present program while the program created by a selected programming language is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description).

- The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action.

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose *receiving a request from a client.*

Broulik discloses *receiving a request from a client.*

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63);...and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm... and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network or web-based system in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

Claim 13:

Ohta discloses **an apparatus wherein the means that identifies a user selection of the current step within the series of steps**.

- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the present program while the program created by a selected programming language is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description).

- The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action.

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose **a request from a client**.

Broulik discloses **a request from a client**.

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63); ...and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm... and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

Claim 14:

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose **an apparatus wherein the means for the request is a HyperText Transfer Protocol**.

Broulik discloses **an apparatus wherein the means for the request is a HyperText Transfer Protocol**.

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63); ...and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm... and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client. The HyperText Transfer Protocol (http) server is used to receive requests from clients.

Ohta and Broulik are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

7.　　Claims 5-6, 8-10, 15-16, 18-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ohta (US 5697788; hereafter Ohta) in view of Broulik et al (US 6323881; hereafter Broulik) in further view of Hind US 5697788; hereafter Hind).

Claim 5:

Ohta discloses *a method presenting current step inline with a series of steps* (Fig. 15).

Broulik discloses *Java*.

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser. The browser is a platform independent GUI engine that accepts and interprets standard data formatting descriptions (HTML), standard script language

constructs (JavaScript) and standard Java written small programs (applets)" (col. 3, lines 55-63).

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to create a GUI that presents steps with a GUI that is web applicable with a language like Java.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a GUI that presents steps that could be accessed remotely by multiple users via web.

Ohta and Broulik do not appear to explicitly disclose *a method using a Java Server Page*.

However, Hind discloses *a method presenting a Java Server Page.*

- Hind discloses that "using Java Server Pages to enable transcoding the content of a document requested by a client, in order to tailor the output document according to application-specific characteristics." (abstract).

- The examiner notes that Hind uses Java Server Pages for client-server oriented tasks and Java is used to program web pages.

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind are both analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta, Broulik, and Hind before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server because it allows tasks to be listed and oriented in a network system with an universal web based language like Java. Since a Java Server Page is a derivation of Java, it would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill to create a response that is with Java as taught by Broulik in combination with a Java Server Page as taught by Hind.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an user interface with inline navigation
representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system
in order to allow an user to see a series of steps in a task on a internet system with a
Java Server Page (see abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hind with Broulik and Ohta to obtain
the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 6:

Ohta discloses *a method of retrieving a step component for the current step
includes retrieving the step component using a Tiles framework* (Fig. 15).

- According to the applicant, "**Tiles** is a framework that allows users to provide a
  consistent user interface. The Tiles framework allows users to display portions or
  "components" of content within a larger page of content, and to download and
  process just one section of the interface at a time, thus decreasing bandwidth
  needs. These content components, which are typically rectangular boxes of
  content, are reusable and may be used in recursive or nested fashion"
  (paragraph 36).

- The examiner notes that Fig. 15 displays reusable rectangular boxes with tasks
  on them that can be used in a recursive or nested manner.

Claim 8:

Ohta discloses *a method wherein the response page includes a navigation tile,
wherein the navigation tile presents a plurality of tasks* (Fig 15).
- According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the
  present program while the program created by a selected programming language
  is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description).

- In paragraph [0044] and Fig. 5, the applicant defines the user interface includes a navigation tile and a task tile. **Navigation tile** may present a set of tasks to be performed. Task tile may present a series of steps to be performed for a current task.

- The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action. Hence Ohta shows the previous tasks, the current task, the details of the current task, and the succeeding tasks, thus satisfying the definition for the applicant's navigation task.

Claim 9:

Ohta discloses *a method of identifying a current task within the plurality of tasks; retrieving a task tile for the current task; and presenting the task tile as a series of steps* (Fig. 15).

- According to the applicant, "**Tiles** is a framework that allows users to provide a consistent user interface. The Tiles framework allows users to display portions or "components" of content within a larger page of content, and to download and process just one section of the interface at a time, thus decreasing bandwidth needs. These content components, which are typically rectangular boxes of content, are reusable and may be used in recursive or nested fashion" (paragraph 36).

- The examiner notes that Fig. 15 displays reusable rectangular boxes with tasks on them that can be used in a recursive or nested manner.

Claim 10:

Ohta discloses *a method of a identifying a current step within the series of steps* (Fig. 15).

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose *sending the response page to the client*.

Broulik discloses *sending the response page to the client*.

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63); ...and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm... and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hind with Broulik and Ohta to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 15:

Ohta discloses *an apparatus with a means for presenting current step inline with a series of steps* (Fig. 15).

Broulik discloses *Java*.

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser. The
  browser is a platform independent GUI engine that accepts and interprets
  standard data formatting descriptions (HTML), standard script language
  constructs (JavaScript) and standard Java written small programs (applets)"
  (col 3, lines 55-63).

Ohta and Broulik do not appear to explicitly disclose *an apparatus with a means for presenting a Java Server Page*.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to create a GUI that presents steps with a GUI that is web applicable with a language like Java.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a GUI that presents steps that could be accessed remotely by multiple users via web.

However, Hind discloses *an apparatus with a means for presenting a Java Server Page*.

- Hind discloses that "using Java Server Pages to enable transcoding the
  content of a document requested by a client, in order to tailor the output
  document according to application-specific characteristics." (abstract).

- The examiner notes that Hind uses Java Server Pages for client-server
  oriented tasks and Java is used to program web pages.

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind are both analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta, Broulik, and Hind before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication

with a client and server because it allows tasks to be listed and oriented in a network system with an universal web based language like Java. Since a Java Server Page is a derivation of Java, it would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill to create a response that is with Java as taught by Broulik in combination with a Java Server Page as taught by Hind.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow an user to see a series of steps in a task on a internet system with a Java Server Page (see abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hind with Broulik and Ohta to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 16:

Ohta discloses **an apparatus of retrieving a step component for the current step includes retrieving the step component using a Tiles framework** (Fig. 15).

- According to the applicant, "**Tiles** is a framework that allows users to provide a consistent user interface. The Tiles framework allows users to display portions or "components" of content within a larger page of content, and to download and process just one section of the interface at a time, thus decreasing bandwidth needs. These content components, which are typically rectangular boxes of content, are reusable and may be used in recursive or nested fashion" (paragraph 36).

- The examiner notes that Fig. 15 displays reusable rectangular boxes with tasks on them that can be used in a recursive or nested manner.

<u>Claim 18:</u>

Ohta discloses *an apparatus wherein the response page includes a navigation tile, wherein the navigation tile presents a plurality of tasks* (Fig 15).

- In paragraph 44 and Fig. 5, the applicant defines the user interface includes a navigation tile 510 and a task tile 520. **Navigation tile** 510 may present a set of tasks to be performed. Task tile 520 may present a series of steps to be performed for a current task. According to Ohta, "Fig 15 is an illustration showing the algorithm window of the present program while the program created by a selected programming language is being executed in a single-step manner" (see Drawing Description).

- The examiner notes that the left screen shows previous, current, and succeeding steps of a task. The right screen shows the details of the currently selected action. Hence Ohta shows the previous tasks, the current task, the details of the current task, and the succeeding tasks, thus satisfying the definition for the applicant's navigation task.

<u>Claim 19:</u>

Ohta discloses *an apparatus with a means for identifying a current task within the plurality of tasks; means for retrieving a task tile for the current task; and means for presenting the task tile as a series of steps* (Fig. 15).

- According to the applicant, "**Tiles** is a framework that allows users to provide a consistent user interface. The Tiles framework allows users to display portions or "components" of content within a larger page of content, and to download and process just one section of the interface at a time, thus decreasing bandwidth needs. These content components, which are typically rectangular boxes of content, are reusable and may be used in recursive or nested fashion" (paragraph 36).

- The examiner notes that Fig. 15 displays reusable rectangular boxes with tasks on them that can be used in a recursive or nested manner.

Claim 20:

Ohta discloses *an apparatus with a means for identifying a current step within the series of steps* (Fig. 15).

Ohta does not appear to explicitly disclose *sending the response page to the client.*

Broulik discloses *sending the response page to the client.*

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63); …and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm… and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client.

Ohta and Broulik are both analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow a user or multiple users to access the application.

Claim 21:

Ohta discloses *a step of a task, wherein the task includes a series of steps to be performed;...[and] presents the current step inline within the series of steps such that the step component is presented in context within the series of steps.* (Fig. 15)

Broulik discloses *a server...[in which the task stated above that rejected by the prior art from Ohta] is used by a method comprising: a controller, wherein the controller receives a request from a client, wherein the request identifies a current step within the series of steps, and wherein the controller retrieves a step component for the current step and Java.*

- According to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser (col 3, lines 55-63); ...and the HTTP server receives requests from browsers one at a time. The HTTP server is supported by common gateway interface (CGI) tasks (programs). Requests accepted by the server are passed to CGI tasks for execution/processing. The CGI tasks then return the results to the browsers" (col 3, line 64 – col 4, line 7). Also, "a web based GUI works on the client-server paradigm... and are based on standard protocols TCP/IP and HTTP" (col 3, lines 50-55).

- Also, according to Broulik, "in web terminology, the client is called a browser. The browser is a platform independent GUI engine that accepts and interprets standard data formatting descriptions (HTML), standard script language constructs (JavaScript) and standard Java written small programs (applets)" (col 3, lines 55-63).

- The examiner notes that in order for web page to function, the standard TCP/IP is used. The client makes a request to the server, the server processes the request, and the server sends a response to the client.

- The examiner also notes that the applicant's definition of a "controller" in paragraph 36. The applicant states, "Struts provides a flexible control layer based on standard technologies, such as servlets, JavaBeans, extensible Markup Language (XML), and an application architecture design based on a variation of a Model-View-Controller (MVC) design. Struts provides its own Controller component and integrates with other technologies to deliver the Model and View components." Thus, the examiner concludes that the "controller" performs the same function as the http server.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta and Broulik before him or her, to create a GUI that presents steps with a GUI that is web applicable with a language like Java.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a GUI that presents steps that could be accessed remotely by multiple users via web.

However, Ohta and Broulik do not explicitly disclose *a Java Server Page, wherein the Java Server Page builds a response page*.

- However, Hind discloses a method presenting a Java Server Page. Hind discloses that "using Java Server Pages to enable transcoding the content of a document requested by a client, in order to tailor the output document according to application-specific characteristics." (abstract). The examiner notes that Hind uses Java Server Pages for client-server oriented tasks and Java is used to program web pages.

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind are both analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta, Broulik, and Hind before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server because it allows tasks to be listed and oriented in a network system with an universal web based language like Java. Since a Java Server Page is a derivation of Java, it would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill to create a response that is with Java as taught by Broulik in combination with a Java Server Page as taught by Hind.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow an user to see a series of steps in a task on a internet system with a Java Server Page (see abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hind with Broulik and Ohta to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 23:

Ohta discloses *a method of retrieving a step component for the current step includes retrieving the step component using a Tiles framework* (Fig. 15).

- According to the applicant, "**Tiles** is a framework that allows users to provide a consistent user interface. The Tiles framework allows users to display portions or "components" of content within a larger page of content, and to download and process just one section of the interface at a time, thus decreasing bandwidth needs. These content components, which are typically rectangular boxes of content, are reusable and may be used in recursive or nested fashion" (paragraph 36).

The examiner notes that Fig. 15 displays reusable rectangular boxes with tasks on them that can be used in a recursive or nested manner.

8.   Claims 7,17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ohta (US 5697788; hereafter Ohta) in view of Broulik et al (US 6323881; hereafter Broulik) and in further view of Hind (US 6715129; hereafter Hind) and in further view of Scheinblum ("Make Your Applications Strut"; http://builder.com.com/5100-6386-1027640.html; hereafter Schein').

Claim 7:

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind teach the invention as mentioned above.

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind does not discloses explicitly disclose *a method wherein building the response page using a Struts framework*.

However, Schein' discloses *a method presenting a Struts Framework*.

- Schein' states that "the Struts Framework is a Java-based technology that allows Web application developers to take advantage of object-oriented design, reusable code, and "write once, run anywhere" functionality. Struts provides a framework for creating Web applications that abstracts the backend code of your applications from the display, or presentation, of your data" (1st paragraph).
- The examiner notes that Struts, which is based on Java technology, can be used on any web application, including response pages that are web-based.

Ohta, Broulik, Hind, and Schein' are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta, Broulik, Hind, and Schein' before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server with Tiles and Struts because it allows tasks to be listed and oriented in a GUI with rectangular windows-like fashion in a network system with an universal web based language like Java.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow an user to see a series of steps in a task on a internet system with a Java Server Page (see abstract) and also allow a frame work for the webpage using Struts.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schein with Ohta, Broulik, and Hind to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 17:

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind teach the invention as mentioned above.

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind does not discloses explicitly disclose *an apparatus with a means for building the response page using a Struts framework*.

- However, Schein' discloses an apparatus with a means for presenting a Struts Framework. Schein' discloses that "the Struts Framework is a Java-based technology that allows Web application developers to take advantage of object-oriented design, reusable code, and "write once, run anywhere" functionality. Struts provides a framework for creating Web applications that abstracts the backend code of your applications from the display, or presentation, of your data" (1st paragraph).
- The examiner notes that Struts, which is based on Java technology, can be used on any web application, including response pages that are web-based.

Ohta, Broulik, Hind, and Schein' are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta, Broulik, Hind, and Schein' before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication

with a client and server with Tiles and Struts because it allows tasks to be listed and event oriented in a GUI with rectangular windows-like fashion in a network system with an universal web based language like Java.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow an user to see a series of steps in a task on a internet system with a Java Server Page (see abstract) and also allow a frame work for the webpage using Struts.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schein with Ohta, Broulik, and Hind to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 22:

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind teach the invention as mentioned above.

Ohta, Broulik, and Hind does not discloses explicitly disclose *a server wherein the controller and the Java Server Page use a Struts framework*.

- However, Schein' discloses a server wherein the controller and the Java Server Page use a Struts framework. Schein' discloses that "the Struts Framework is a Java-based technology that allows Web application developers to take advantage of object-oriented design, reusable code, and "write once, run anywhere" functionality. Struts provides a framework for creating Web applications that abstracts the backend code of your applications from the display, or presentation, of your data" (1st paragraph).
- The examiner notes that Struts, which is based on Java technology, can be used on any web application, including response pages that are web-based.

Ohta, Broulik, Hind, and Schein' are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of graphical user interface applications.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ohta, Broulik, Hind, and Schein before him or her, to modify the GUI that identifies a current step within the series of steps to include communication with a client and server with Tiles and Struts because it allows tasks to be listed and oriented in a GUI with rectangular windows-like fashion in a network system with an universal web based language like Java.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an user interface with inline representation of steps in a multi-stepped process in conjunction with a network system in order to allow an user to see a series of steps in a task on a internet system with a Java Server Page (see abstract) and also allow a frame work for the webpage using Struts.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schein with Ohta, Broulik, and Hind to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Soumya (Ronnie) Dasgupta whose telephone number is 571-270-7432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Del Sole can be reached on 571-272-1130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SD

JOSEPH DEL SOLE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
5/7/07